

Claim 25 recites, “said identification system module containing an authorization code describing which media players are authorized to read digital data from said digital storage medium.” The system of Pickholtz does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation. Rather, Pickholtz’ system is intended to limit “program execution to only an authorized data processing system” (see abstract).

Claims 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Pickholtz. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 26-30 depend from Claim 25 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons discussed above, Pickholtz does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 25, much less the limitations of Claim 25 in combination with the additional limitations recited by Claims 26-30.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,593,353 to Pickholtz (“Pickholtz”). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 31 recites, “said identification system module containing an authorization code indicating which media readers are authorized to read digital storage medium.” The system of Pickholtz does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation. Rather, Pickholtz’ system is intended to limit “program execution to only an authorized data processing system” (see abstract).

Claims 32-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Pickholtz. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 32-40 depend from Claim 31 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons discussed above, Pickholtz does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 31, much less the limitations of Claim 31 in combination with the additional limitations recited by Claims 32-40.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned “Version With Markings To Show Changes Made.”

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-40, accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-40 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418

Version With Markings To Show Changes Made

In the claims:

Claims 20, 41, and 42 have been canceled.

Claim 28 has been amended as follows:

B1

28. (amended) The secure data storage medium of Claim 25, said identification system module comprising a [TIRIS] radio frequency transponder.